UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,178	07/31/2003	Katsuhisa Kataoka	JP920020135US1	9826

46320 7590 09/17/2007	EXAMINER
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP	PRICE, NATHAN E
STEVEN M. GREENBERG	

950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE	ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3020	2194
BOCA RATON, FL 33487	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/632,178	KATAOKA, KATSUHISA
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Price	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *19-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *19-36* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to communications received 25 June 2007.

Claims 19 – 36 are pending. Previous objections and rejections not included in this

Office Action have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 25 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argues the references teach retrieving the XML document from the

cache and not the data resulting from processing the XML document as claimed. While

Ayyagari does teach retrieving the XML document from the cache, Ayyagari also

teaches retrieving the data resulting from processing the XML document (col. 4 lines 59

– 63). Patel teaches the series of events and event set information associated with

processing XML documents (¶ 35).

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 19 – 24 and 28 – 36 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

There is insufficient antecedent basis for numerous elements. For example,

there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the first application program" in line 11 of claim

19, "the cache" in line 9 of claim 21 and "the processing object" in line 4 of claim 28.

The dependent claims inherit the deficiencies of claim(s) on which they are dependent.

The supplied set of examples is not exhaustive and Applicant is required to review all

claims for proper antecedent basis of recited elements. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 20, 26, 30, 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20, 26 and 32 recite multiple instances of event set information and refer

to the event set information. It is not clear which instance is being referenced.

Claims 30 and 36 recite the limitation "the first and second processing steps" in

lines 2 – 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 19 – 21, 25 – 27 and 31 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Ayyagari et al. (US 7,020,681 B1; hereinafter Ayyagari) in view

of Patel (US 2002/0107881 A1).

6.   As to claim 19, Ayyagari teaches an interface apparatus for a first structured

document, comprising:

   a first processor for

      ' receiving a processing request from an application program, as a

processing requester, for a first structured document (col. 4 lines 50 – 67), and

         performing a lexical analysis of the first structured document (col. 1 line 55

– col. 2 lines 4, 26 – 60; col. 4 lines 50 – 67);

   store means for

         associating the information with the first structured document (col. 4 lines

50 – 67),

         storing the information into a cache (col. 4 lines 50 – 67); and

   first notification means for notifying the application program of the information

related to the structured document in order from the information in the cache, upon the

information being in the cache with respect to the structured document prior to the

processing request being received (col. 4 lines 50 – 67).

7.   Ayyagari teaches processing XML documents (col. 4 lines 50 – 67), but fails to specifically teach series of events and event set information. However, Patel teaches the series of events and event set information associated with processing XML documents (¶ 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these teachings because Ayyagari teaches processing XML documents and Patel teaches what is involved in processing XML documents.

8.   As to claim 20, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches:

a second processor for performing a lexical analysis of a second structured document having information not in the cache (col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 lines 4, 26 – 60; col. 4 lines 50 – 67; col. 6 lines 1 – 28);

second notification means for notifying a second application program as a processing requester of information relating to the second structured document in order, wherein

the store means associates the information, notified to the second application program by the second notification means as the information, with the second structured document to storing the information into a cache (col. 4 lines 50 – 67).

9.   See the rejection of claim 19 regarding series of events and event set information.

10.   As to claim 21, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches an interface
apparatus for a structured document, comprising:

  second processing means for reading the information of the cache with
respect to the structured document and notifying the application program of the
information (col. 4 lines 50 – 67); and

  control means for checking whether or not the information relating to the
structured document is in the cache to delegate the processing of the structured
document to the first processing means upon the information not being in the
cache, or to the second processing means upon the information being in the
cache (col. 4 lines 50 – 67).

11.   See the rejection of claim 19 regarding series of events and event set
information. See the rejections of claims 19 and 20 regarding limitations not specifically
addressed in this rejection.

12.   As to claims 25 – 27 and 31 – 33, see the rejection of claims 19 – 21.

13.   Claims 22 – 24, 28 – 30 and 34 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as
being unpatentable over Ayyagari in view of Patel as applied to claims 21, 27 and 33
above, and further in view of Coulouris (see PTO-892 mailed 23 March 2007).

14.   As to claim 22, combination of Ayyagari and Patel teaches the control means

judges presence/absence of the event set information of the structured document in the

cache, and judges that there is the event set information in the cache with respect to the

structured document when the event set information relating to a structured document

having the same file name as that of the structured document exists in the cache

(Ayyagari: col. 4 lines 1 – 27, 50 – 67; Patel: ¶ 35).

15.   Ayyagari fails to specifically teach the condition of when the event set information

relates to a structured document before update of the existing structured document.

However, Coulouris teaches validating cached data (page 231 "Client caching"). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's

invention was made to combine these teachings because Ayyagari teaches using

caches and Coulouris teaches details about caching.

16.   As to claim 23, Ayyagari teaches the control means is a parser notified from the

application program of a request of the structured document by URL (col. 4 lines 50 –

67), making it obvious to use a URI.

17.   As to claim 24, Ayyagari teaches the first and second processing means are

mounted in corresponding parsers and the control means is mounted in the application

program (col. 4 lines 50 – 67; col. 5 line 59 – col. 6 line 28).

18.   As to claims 28 – 30 and 34 – 36, see the rejection of claim 22 – 24.

Conclusion

19.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP
§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37
CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 2:30pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

WILLIAM THOMSON
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER